

## REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 29-40 and 42-45 are pending in the application; of which claims 6, 29, 30, 32, 35, 39 and 45 are being amended under Rule 312. The claim amendments add no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is being amended to change "(b)" and "(c)" to correctly recite "(c)" and "(d)" to ensure accurate lettering. Claim 6 is dependent on Claim 1, the body of which contains elements lettered as "(a)" and "(b)".

Claim 29 is being amended to recite "...to a temperature of from about...", which cosmetically improves the claim language.

Claim 30 is being amended to change "...temperature at least..." to recite "...temperature of at least...", which cosmetically improves the claim language.

Claim 32 is being amended to correct the erroneous inclusion of "temperature".

Claim 35 is being amended to remove "...by spraying or rinsing the process deposits on the surface..." to avoid redundancy. Claim 35 is dependent on Claim 1, in which part (b) states "cooling the surface comprising the process deposits...by...immersing...and spraying the surface with the liquid nitrogen...". Hence, the aforementioned passage from Claim 35 becomes superfluous and deletion of such does not affect the scope of the claim.

Claim 39 is being amended to change "(b)" and "(c)" to correctly recite "(c)" and "(d)" to ensure accurate lettering. Claim 39 is dependent on Claim 36, the body of which contains elements lettered as "(a)" and "(b)".

Claim 45 is being amended to remove "...by spraying or rinsing the process deposits on the surface..." to avoid redundancy. Claim 45 is dependent on Claim 36, in which part (b) states "cooling the surface comprising the process deposits...by...immersing...or spraying the surface with the liquid nitrogen...". Therefore, the aforementioned passage from Claim 45 becomes superfluous and deletion of such does not affect the scope of the claim.

The amendments are provided to delete unnecessary or redundant words from the claims and/or to cosmetically improve the claim language. Where words are deleted, the proposed amendment only makes express, a recitation of a feature that was already inherent in the original claim, and thus, is not a narrowing of the scope of the properly construed claim. TurboCare v. General Electric Co., 264 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2001); Bose Corp. v. JBL, Inc., 274 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2001); and Interactive Pictures Corp. v. Infinite Pictures, Inc., 274 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The cosmetic claim changes also do not affect the scope of the claims; and thus, the scope of the doctrine of equivalents applied to these claims should not be limited under the rules of Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 535 U.S. 722, 2002 Lexis 3818 (May 28, 2002).


It is believed that the above-discussed amendments should be entered under Rule 312. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the above remarks, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**JANAH & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

Date: June 1, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Ashok Janah  
Reg. No. 37,487

Please direct all telephone calls to: Ashok K. Janah at (415) 538-1555.

Please send correspondence to:

Janah & Associates, P.C.  
650 Delancey Street, Suite 106  
San Francisco, CA 94107